



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,415	07/13/2001	Travis W. Loyd	10010635-1	4730

7590 11/10/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HOFFMAN, BRANDON S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/905,415

Applicant(s)

LOYD, TRAVIS W.

Examiner

Brandon Hoffman

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - On page 2, beginning on line 17 with "Thus, only the..." and ending on line 21 with "... the corresponding public key." Both sentences portray the same thing. Remove one sentence, or consider revising.Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 5-10, 12, 15-20, 22, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Linsker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,680,455).

Regarding claims 1, 12, and 22, Linsker et al. teaches a method/system/printer for regulating the ability of a user to print on a printer, comprising:

- A sending processor that includes a private key of a user, where the private key forms a key pair with a public key, the sending processor being adapted to

encrypt an aspect of a print job using the private key and to send the print job and encrypted aspect over a network (col. 4, lines 43-58); and

- A printer in communication with the sending processor, where the printer is adapted to receive the print job and encrypted aspect from the sending processor, to verify the user by decoding the encrypted aspect using the public key, and to print a document based on the print job if the user is a verified user (col. 4, line 66 through col. 5, line 50).

Regarding claims 5, 15, and 25, Linsker et al. teaches where the aspect relates to content of the print job (col. 4, lines y-z).

Regarding claims 6, 16, and 26, Linsker et al. teaches where the aspect, after encryption, is a digital signature (col. 4, lines 45-49).

Regarding claims 7, 17, and 27, Linsker et al. teaches where the public key is included in a digital certificate (col. 5, lines 7-19).

Regarding claims 8, 18, and 28, Linsker et al. teaches where the public key is included in the print job (col. 4, lines 55-58).

Regarding claims 9, 19, and 29, Linsker et al. teaches where the public key is obtained by the printer from a public key database (col. 5, lines 3-7).

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Linsker et al. teaches where the public key is linked to an authorization table that permits the user to print on the printer (col. 8, lines 10-12).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-4, 11, 13, 14, 21, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linsker et al. (USPN '455) in view of Davis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,633,932).

Regarding claims 2, 3, 13, and 23, Linsker et al. teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 12, and 22, respectively, above. However, Linsker et al. does not teach where the printer is located at a printing site and the user is verified upon a demonstration that the user possesses the private key at the printing site.

Davis et al. teaches where the printer is located at a printing site and the user is verified upon a demonstration that the user possesses the private key at the printing site (col. 5, line 34 through col. 6, line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the printer located at a printing site and the user is verified by demonstrating that the user possesses the private key at the printing site, as taught by Davis et al., with the method/system/printer of Linsker et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because this forces the user to be present to accept the document, which inherently adds another level of security.

Regarding claims 4, 14, and 24, the combination of Linsker et al. in view of Davis et al. teaches where the private key is stored on a portable processor and possession is demonstrated with a locally-restricted optical signal (see col. 5, lines 52-65 of Davis et al.).

Regarding claims 11 and 21, Linsker et al. teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 12, respectively, above. However, Linsker et al. does not teach where the print job is at least partially encrypted by the user with a public key of the printer.

Davis et al. teaches where the print job is at least partially encrypted by the user with a public key of the printer (col. 4, lines 39-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the print job is at least partially encrypted by the user with a public key of the printer, as taught by Davis et al., with the method/system/printer

of Linsker et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because this ensures only the printer will be able to decrypt the document. Any usurpers will not be able to access the printers' private key to properly decrypt the data.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Branda Heft*

BH

*Ayaz Sheikh*  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100